UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Liberty Is a Quality of Character - - - - - - - - - - *Sheldon Shepard*

Why Dumbarton Oaks? - *O. A. Hammand*

Which Kind of Christianity at the Peace Table? - - - - - *John Malick*

Adventures in the Realm of Ideas - - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

THE STUDY TABLE
John Haynes Holmes

VOLUME CXXXI NUMBER 2

Chicago, April, 1945

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

O. A. Hammand: Attorney and free lance journalist.

John Malick: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Duluth, Minnesota.

Sheldon Shepard: Minister of The People's Church of San Fernando Valley, California; author of *Peace of Mind in Time of War.*

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and former editorial writer, *Chicago Daily News.*

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 19

Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 22

ARTICLES—

Liberty Is a Quality of Character—SHELDON SHEPARD..... 22

Why Dumbarton Oaks?—O. A. HAMMAND..... 23

Which Kind of Christianity at the Peace Table?—JOHN MALICK. 25

Adventures in the Realm of Ideas—VICTOR S. YARROS..... 27

Beneficence of Death—ADELINE RIES..... 29

POETRY—

Shepherdess of Dreams—JANE RAWLINS SHEEAN..... 24

THE STUDY TABLE—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 30

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 32

THE FIELD—

A Tribute to Governor Arnall of Georgia..... 18

The Field

"The world is my country,
to do good is my Religion."

A Tribute to Governor Arnall of Georgia

A resounding, though unheralded, break in the solid front of the eight poll-tax states of the South has occurred. The Georgia legislature, at the forceful initiative of a young, progressive governor, has abolished the tax on voting (poll tax).

Obviously it is desirable that, wherever possible, anti-poll-tax measures be initiated and carried through by natives of the states primarily concerned: democratic reform is most admirable when it springs from the moral convictions and is achieved by the elective powers of the community in which reform is needed. The great argument of the reactionary politicians, whose careers are based on a restricted suffrage in their home states, was and is that anti-poll-tax sentiment is exclusively a "foreign" doctrine. Georgia's action effectively disproves the demagogic claim that the people of the poll-tax states themselves are, by some quaint persuasion, favorable to the device that decimates the electorate.

There is a vast stirring in the masses of the common people of the South which has expressed itself of late in the election of progressive candidates to public office. Hill of Alabama, Pepper of Florida, Fulbright of Arkansas, are cases in point. The Deep South is in process of taking its rightful place abreast of the historic epoch in which it lives. The war has accelerated this tendency by making clear the indispensability of the common man—in the armed forces, in the factory, on the farm. It is difficult to publicly oppose enfranchisement of those who defend the country. It is almost equally difficult to stand against votes for their brothers who are producing the munitions with which they fight and the food which sustains the nation in its time of peril.

We salute Governor Ellis Arnall of Georgia for his leadership in this historic upheaval. He stands directly in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson of Virginia and Andrew Jackson of Tennessee, great popular leaders in their epochs. It is time that out of the South should again come a voice which speaks for the common man who by the work of his hand and brain has made America. The emergence of Governor Arnall to the front rank of progressive political leaders in this country is a warning to those regressive forces which have long monopolized political and economic power in the South. In his career, the Governor of Georgia symbolizes the arrival of the people to power and gives earnest of an unshackled and progressive South.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXXI APRIL, 1945 No. 2

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Francis Neilson, in the fourth volume of his remarkable war diary, *The Tragedy of Europe,* asks some pertinent questions in regard to these international conferences in which a small group of men, the heads of nations, sit down together and carve out the destinies of mankind. Speaking of Cairo and Teheran, Mr. Neilson writes (page 266), December 5, 1943 entry:

> I ask myself whether [these men] had democratic authority to act for a majority of the people in their respective states. Does Mr. Churchill act for the people of the British Empire? Certainly not! He does not even act for the majority of the people of the homeland. . . Then there is Chiang Kai-shek, who by no stretch of the imagination can be called representative of China. As for Mr. Roosevelt, he was elected as an isolationist. . .

By what right, in other words, do these men arrogate to themselves the privilege of deciding how the problems of this world shall be worked out? Who gave Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt, for example, the power to dismember Poland in the interest of Russia? When were the Premier and the President authorized to decide the fate of Germany and the German people? It is true that Mr. Churchill on these occasions submits his doings to Parliament and asks a vote of confidence on a *fait accompli.* This is at least going through the motions of democracy! Mr. Roosevelt makes a similar report, which we may like or dislike—it makes no difference. But the question remains—how come? And the answer is simple. These men foregather in this fashion and decide the destinies of men because they have the *power.* Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt hold at their command enormous armies, and hence can do what they like. They can take things into their own hands, and determine the lives of their own and other peoples as may best suit them. They may say "Come" to Chiang Kai-shek, and he comes—or "Stay" to General De Gaulle, and he stays. These men are absolute dictators, doing what they please, as they please, and all the time doing things that cannot be again undone. And all because they have *power*—armed power to work their will! It is well to ponder this fact, because this is what war does to us. It destroys not merely the enemy but ourselves. In all the things that count today our democracy is gone. We are in the hands of dictators. Mr. Neilson calls them "the dictators of the democracies"—a perfect phrase! Once the war is over there will remain the stupendous task of getting rid of dictators at home as we will have triumphantly gotten rid of them abroad.

II

The Polish settlement, started months before Yalta, at the dictation of Russia, is the outstanding crime of this hour. The English are denouncing it much more fiercely than we are, probably because it is nearer. Witness, for example, the statement of the Friends Peace Committee in London, as published by the *Friends Intelligencer* of Philadelphia. Referring to the annexation of Eastern Poland by Russia, and the promise of territorial compensation for Poland at the expense of Germany, the statement says:

> The proposals now made are wrong; they outrage humanity; . . . they undermine the spiritual and cultural life of Europe; . . . they destroy man's integrity. Whatever may be the origins of the Atlantic Charter, it was given out and accepted as the moral stand of the United Nations. . . . This type of policy . . . if persisted in . . . will bring to nought all hopes for the permanence of peace and will plant the dire seeds of a third World War.

What is unanswerable in a statement of this kind is the moral appeal. These proposals, or rather agreements, "are *wrong;* they outrage humanity." There is nothing you can say in refutation of that! O, yes—they are expedient. They were the best that could be had under the circumstances. They were a necessary compromise with Russia. Russia, in other words, had to be appeased as a condition of her continued alliance in the war against Germany. And how was she appeased? By dismembering an Ally, without permission of or consultation with her people. By making Poland an impossible economic unit after this war as Austria was after the last war, and therefore doomed to perish. Then, to amend so dreadful a situation, Poland is to be given compensation by tearing Germany apart, and giving Poland East Prussia, again without any consultation with the people concerned as expressly stipulated by the Atlantic Charter. Two wrongs, in other words, in this case make a

right—especially as the Poles and East Prussians are weak and therefore have no voice in large affairs. Is this the way to make peace, think you—by deliberate defiance of the moral law? We tried it in this country before the Civil War—to stave off that conflict by compromising with principle, by appeasing the slave oligarchy of the South, by doing everything except justice to the black man. Henry Clay passed great compromise measures once, twice, thrice—and what good did they do? The Civil War came just the same, as the very result of these expediential measures. And so will the third World War come as the very result of what we are doing now with Poland and Germany. It is wrong, *wrong,* WRONG—and nothing can prevent the consequences. One would think that one Versailles were enough. But, no—we must now have another. The English Quakers see it, and are honest enough to say it.

III

Listen, friends, to the words of Gandhi, spoken recently in India, in denunciation of the arrest of some more of the leaders of the Indian people! More than 10,000 of these outstanding citizens are now in prison, for no other reason than that they protest against the British occupation of their country. This is what Gandhi says:

> If things go on as they are going in India, the victory that the Allies will have will be only so-called, because they will also have India and other nations in the same plight bleeding at their feet. Such victory can only lead in the near future to a war bloodier if possible than the one that will have closed, for victory at the expense of India will mean that out of the ashes of Fascism, Nazism, and Japanese militarism will have risen a new monster that will seek to eat all it sees—and in the attempt will be eaten up, leaving I know not what.

The same message is now being spoken here in America by a distinguished visitor from India—Mrs. Pandit, the sister of the great Jawarhalal Nehru, who has been in prison since August, 1942. Mrs. Pandit has herself been behind British bars, and her husband died in jail. And Mrs. Pandit reminds us, as Gandhi reminds us, that this situation in India is a struggle for liberation as truly as any struggle in the occupied countries of Europe for liberation from Nazi arms. What folly it is to talk of peace after this war, with hundreds of millions of people in Asia and elsewhere in a condition of subjection to tyranny! Why bother to write Yalta agreements reaffirming Atlantic Charters, when the basic principles of these charters are denied application to Indians, Africans, Malayans, Burmese, and other helpless nationalities? Can we never understand how hollow seem even our finest words, and how futile our most solemn pledges, to these peoples who are not free? That they are determined to be free, as they "of a right ought to be free," is elementary. And that there can be no peace in the world until they are free, should be equally elementary. Americans, English, French should be the first to recognize and sympathize with these facts. Yet is it as sure as sunrise tomorrow morning, that under the international setup now being arranged by the Big Three, these nations, if they continue their struggles, will be adjudged "aggressor nations" and put down accordingly. One may cry peace, peace, until the end of time, but there will be no peace under these conditions. Peace can be achieved only in terms of freedom for all mankind. Any subjection anywhere will bring another war. Gandhi is right! The fact that the conqueror of India is Britain, and not Nazi Germany as in Norway and Denmark, does not alter the situation in the slightest. This world is "one world"; the people in it are one people. So long as anywhere there are masters and slaves, big nations and little nations, military powers and imperialistic rules, so long will there be disturbance, struggle, and war. The problem of peace is simple—so simple that it terrifies the powers-that-be to think of it.

IV

Just for the comfort of it—the correction of it—I print the following dispatch from the *Chicago Daily News*. All honor to Jack Bell, the correspondent who had the courage and vision to send this story to his paper, and all honor to the *News* for publishing it! Remember when you hear the Germans called Huns, and are told that they are all Hitlerian monsters, and that they should all be exterminated or sterilized, and that Germans anyway are different from the rest of human nature—just remember this anecdote of a humble German prisoner, an unknown man in the welter of German arms, who was willing to "lay down his life" not for his friend but for his enemy! I insist that, by and large, all men are the same everywhere, God having "made of one blood all nations." The best and the worst are to be found in every country. Given the same conditions, human nature reacts the same the world around. What we are, our neighbors are; and what our neighbors are, we are. Heroes and villains together! Well, here is one of the heroes, a German:

German Medic Risks His Life to Save Yanks

By JACK BELL

Daily News Foreign Service

(WITH THE 9TH ARMY)—(Delayed)—Some incidents that have occurred recently on this front:

An American tank moved up a road toward the Germans on the Roer River, accompanied by infantry troops. A German artillery shell hit the tank, killing and wounding a number of both parties.

The men not wounded ran into the woods and a mine field. Several had legs blown off. Down the road from the front, a few hundred yards away, came Americans with Jerry prisoners. They reached the wrecked tank and wounded men. One of the prisoners was a Medical Corps sergeant and asked permission to go to work. He dressed the wounded on the road, then started toward those in the woods.

"Don't come," they cried; "it's mined."

The sergeant went anyway, picked up two men and carried them to the road, where he placed them as far as possible under the tank for protection. When he went for

the third American he stepped on a mine, and one foot was blown off.

American aid men came up from their lines, carried off the wounded men the German sergeant had cared for, then started for him.

"Minen! Minen" he cried. And it's good to report that the Americans took the chance and rescued him, saying: "If he's man enough to help us, then warns us of mines, he's all right."

Incidentally, it is interesting to note how stories of this kind, the few that come across, are always "delayed"!

V

It looks as though this fight against the slavery of military conscription might be won! In the beginning the situation looked pretty hopeless. The Army, the Navy, and the administration generally were united in a determination to put this through at once. No delay, no nonsense! But most unexpectedly there came trouble over the labor draft. The President told the Congress to enact the May Bill, but it refused to do so. Labor and capital were for once united in opposition to this measure, and liberal forces everywhere were against it. So the weeks passed, and nothing was heard of post-war conscription. A law which was to be enacted without public hearings in January has still to move in April. That is pretty good! The explanation is of course partly political—the sixes and sevens situation in Washington. The administration is split from end to end, Democrats hate Democrats worse than they do Republicans and the President's support of any policy is good reason for many of his own party to oppose it. But more important is the power of public opinion which is rolling up against conscription. Catholics and Protestants, educators and social workers, liberals, progressives, and even conservatives—all except Communists, who would impose upon this country the military system of Soviet Russia!—are united against this proposal. At least, against action upon it *now!* There is the great point—that we shall not anticipate and perhaps ruin the peace settlement by putting America permanently under arms while the fighting is still going on. The thing to do is to wait, to see what kind of a world we are going to be living in after this war. Any real peace must be accompanied and guaranteed by disarmament—and this nation should be ready among the first to disarm. But at bottom, the real opposition to post-war military conscription waits not upon policy but upon principle. This system is inconsistent with all that we mean by democracy. It is fatal to democracy. It cannot insure peace, else would its presence and practice in every European country have long since brought peace to that unhappy continent. But it can insure the subjection of a whole people to the state, the corruption of the public conscience by the military mind, and the triumph of regimentation over freedom. Nothing has been so distinctive of our free democratic life in the past as the absence of militarism. If, now, as a result of this war to end war, we adopt conscription, then will we lock step with the other nations of the world in the dead march of tyranny. The importance of this fight against post-war conscription cannot be exaggerated. Nothing less than the whole destiny of America is at stake.

VI

The late Burris A. Jenkins was a remarkable man. His sheer versatility was extraordinary. At various times professor of New Testament literature, president of the University of Indianapolis, and again of the University of Kentucky, editor and publisher of the Kansas City *Post,* member of the 1920 Democratic National Convention where he nominated William Gibbs McAdoo for the presidency, author, lecturer, Dr. Jenkins was a clergyman for fifty-four years, and for thirty-seven of these years was famous as the minister of the Community Church in Kansas City. Ordained a member of the Disciples church, he became impatient of denominational loyalties and limitations, and re-established his Linwood Boulevard Church on strictly community or social lines. His dominant characteristic was unconventionality. He was always doing the unusual, and incidentally the wise and progressive thing. Years ago he introduced dancing into his church, and established church suppers on prayer-meeting nights. He started one of the first church forums in the Middle West. As a preacher he declared that it was his business to stir up discussion—and he succeeded! When his former church edifice burned down, he replaced it with a startling modernistic structure designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. His religion was a religion of universal brotherhood. Catholic, Jew, free thinker had equal place in his heart with professing Protestants. His forum heard speakers of every shade of political opinion from bright red to plain white. He delighted in defying prejudice, and was never so happy as when breaking down barriers and bringing men together. He was of course a mighty force for good in his community, believing that deeds and not creeds were the true evidence of Christian faith. I remember with kindling heart the times I met him, and the Sunday night I addressed his forum. There was a rugged quality about the man, a simplicity and kindliness, that reminded one of Lincoln. The people about him were the common people whom Lincoln loved. There was nothing churchly about this minister. In the service, dignity gave way easily to happiness and heartiness. It was all good will, and a good time, truth, freedom, and the better life. Dr. Jenkins was an institution in Kansas City and in all the country roundabout. One finds it difficult to imagine how things can go on without him. But perhaps it will not be without him. His spirit is a reality that abides.

Jottings

The Musicians Union of New York has declared that Shakespeare's *The Tempest,* as produced by Margaret Webster, is not a drama (with incidental music), but a "musical show." Thus, suddenly, does the swan of Avon become the Bard of Broadway!

Dean Gildersleeve, of Barnard, would banish Hitler to a distant island of the seas. In other words, she would martyrize him in the eyes of the Germans as Napoleon was martyrized in the eyes of the French, and prepare the way for a hero's tomb on the banks of the Spree, to match the hero's tomb on the banks of the Seine. We made this hideous mistake in the case of the Corsican corporal; why repeat it in the case of the Austrian corporal?

Religious and charitable institutions are specifically exempted from the operations of the anti-discrimination bill recently passed in New York state. This means, I take it, that churches can go right on practicing discrimination on account of race, creed or color!

World Events sums up the results of the Yalta Conference as follows:

First, the "have" nations propose, in Mr. Churchill's words, to hold their own.

Second, they intend to liquidate their rivals.

Third, the Yalta statement, because of what it includes and what it excludes, points toward World War III just as inexorably as Versailles pointed to World War II.

Two and a half million Poles driven out of the Polish territory east of the Curzon line, and ten million Germans driven out of German provinces transferred to Poland—this says Middleton Murry, English author, writing in the London *New Statesman,* is "blazing fuel to the Nazi underground movement." Out of such a conflagration of injustice and cruelty we are expecting to get peace! Mr. Murry well states that this is impossible.

Scathing criticism and a refusal to adopt it unless amended, led to the addition of the first ten amendments (the Bill of Rights) to our U.S. Constitution. Similar criticism, and a similar refusal to adopt it unless amended, may make something of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. But mere acceptance and fulsome praise will get us nowhere.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Liberty Is a Quality of Character

SHELDON SHEPARD

Too many persons think that liberty is a commodity to be stored in a social or personal warehouse and doled out in bits as desired. They think an individual or nation can be generous in granting freedom to some persons, ideas, or groups and can withhold the precious gift when they choose. Such "guardians" of liberty always find a good many reasons for denying its blessing to certain individuals, or thoughts, or organizations.

Liberty is no such article, foreign to the spirit of man. It is a quality of character to be attained and to be incorporated into institutions. Milton stated this principle when he declared that no one can love freedom but good men. He said that evil men can have a desire for license, and that license involves the very denial of others' rights, which designates it as the enemy of freedom. If one has the spirit of freedom in him it shines forth on all alike. He cannot any more withdraw its radiance than the sun can retain its rays.

Free speech which permits everyone to say what the majority thinks is not a product of freedom at all, but tends to tyranny. Freedom to do what the majority accepts is a characteristic of dictatorships. Liberty is that spirit in the heart which radiates blessing upon others. Its possessor is no more concerned about his own privileges than he is about the rights of the least of his fellows. Like an artist, seeking beauty everywhere, he rejoices in freedom wherever it is found. And he detests bondage no matter upon whom its chains are fastened.

The cry of liberty is often used as an excuse to get rid of the things we do not like in order to become slaves to what we do like. Such pretense is hypocrisy. Slavery is as bad, perhaps worse, when its chains are of our own forging. Some persons want freedom for themselves so that they can force their ideas, practices and laws upon others. This, too, is a hypocritical imitation of the spirit of liberty.

Liberty is one thing which no one can have unless he gives it to others. As he who is feared by many must fear many, so he who forces bondage on any is bound by them. Members of a majority who possess the true spirit of liberty are more interested in the rights of minorities than they would be if they themselves were the minority. Being true apostles of freedom, they possess its quality enough to enable them to endure fetters upon themselves, but not upon others.

One should not judge his devotion to liberty by the demands he makes for himself, but by his interest in the rights of others. For its true spirit is not primarily concerned with particular legislation and specific situations. It is a habit of attitude, a quality of character, an element of the soul. It is not so much a seeking for self as a giving out for others. It is a radiance in the heart, furnishing light on the pathway and sending out its rays to brighten the faces of all humankind.

Why Dumbarton Oaks?

O. A. HAMMAND

Unless we are willing to go back to the League of Nations, the choice is between Dumbarton Oaks and World War III. Dumbarton is not perfect and nobody knows for sure that it will prevent another war, but everybody knows that without it or some other world organization, there will be another war. Sixty nations which want to emphasize their sovereignty cannot all have their own way in international affairs. Sixty great world machines cannot run through red lights at a high rate of speed without a smashup.

Whether Dumbarton is as good as the League of Nations is a disputed question, but a question which it will probably never be necessary to settle. The two are in many ways very much alike. The league does not technically include the Hague Tribunal which is an organization entirely for arbitration, but it recognizes it and works in harmony with it. It appears to be the plan of Dumbarton not to disturb the Hague. The World Court also at the City of the Hague is a part of the league system but is called an autonomous organ of the league. Of course it is not independent, for it was established by the league, its judges are nominated by the Hague Tribunal and elected by the council and assembly, voting separately. Besides, the league pays all of the expenses of the court. The court, however, functions as an independent body and has made a wonderful record. Under the proposed plan, Dumbarton can or may not take over the court just as it is. Many leading lawyers have proposed that the new organization accept the court just as it is; and then all of the decisions which it has made would remain international law and have an authoritative character and be the basis for future decisions.

Another organ of the league is the International Labor Organization. It also was organized by the league, is supported by the league and covers a wide scope of economic, health, and social problems. It is democratic in its organization, representing the employer, the laborer, and the state; and its field is entirely social justice. I have never heard any responsible man or woman criticize this institution, and it is already planned that its work is to be taken over as a part of the new economic and social council.

There remains the world security feature of the old league and of the Dumbarton Oaks league; just how they will agree or differ nobody can tell for sure until the plan progresses further, for some points have not yet been agreed upon. It is certain, however, that there is to be a council that will have to meet the same kind of problems that the old league had to meet. As they involve the idea of sovereignty, the veto power will probably be retained by the five great powers. It must be kept in mind that the sovereignty of the smaller powers is not an issue and never comes up. They do not have armies and navies and air power big enough to lick the world—and they know it, so they are not so cocky about their sovereignty.

The nations are not really sovereign. They must bargain and make concessions; and after a treaty has been made or a contract for the purchase of property or any other simple thing has been made, they are no longer free to do just as they desire, but come under both a rule of law to perform an obligation and a rule of morals to observe a trust. To talk about sovereignty and sovereign states is idle talk; provincial, tribal, and clannish.

If the new league is no better than the old, then why do we make the change? The answer is entirely psychological. Under the conditions it may be better to make a change. The new organization for the present and the immediate future is in the hands of five nations and largely in the hands of five men. It will be quite an accomplishment if they put over a world organization which will keep the peace, even though they adopt most of the plan and get most of the popular support from the work of those who have gone before. It may not be easy for any of the five nations now leading the movement or the five leaders of those nations to go back to Geneva. It would look too much like the old league again.

Russia was our ally in the first World War, but the czar sent his soldiers into battle with inadequate guns and ammunition and lost the war and signed a separate peace with Germany and gave her considerable territory. This created a bad feeling on the part of the Allies, so they broke off diplomatic relations and sent armies over and invaded their former ally, Russia. They defeated Germany and took back the lost Russian territory, but did not return much of it to Russia, setting up most of it in independent nations. This caused friction between Russia and her former allies, and much of the difference was attributed to the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations.

It thus followed that Russia was not admitted to the league until September, 1934. The league negotiated over the matter for twelve days and nights before it could decide on a form of invitation that Russia was willing to accept and that would not be fought by the delegates to the league. During all of this time the Russian delegation stayed at a little town inside the French border thirty miles from Geneva during the day and came to Geneva and negotiated every night. The invitation as finally presented was signed by thirty delegations, and four other nations notified Russia through diplomatic processes that they would vote for her, but the name of Switzerland— the host to the whole league system—was not included in either list. Only a few years later when World War II came on and Russia attacked Finland, Russia was expelled from the league, but the same treatment was not given to either Japan or Italy. Even at the present time there appears to be no love between Switzerland and Russia. Just how anxious she is to go back to Geneva is a question that Russia alone knows.

China was an enthusiastic member of the league, but when Manchuria was invaded by Japan the league appointed the Lytton Commission which made an investigation and established the principle of nonrecognition. However, it did not do a thing for China. Soon afterward it voted China out of her nonpermanent seat in the council of the league. China is still loyal to the league, but she knows that she has not been given very much support.

France never did want the league. Clemenceau wanted to "just forget it." Finally as an inducement to join, Woodrow Wilson and Lloyd George signed a separate treaty (the Tripartite Treaty) with France,

in which they agreed to support France in case she was attacked by Germany, but America refused to ratify it along with the Treaty of Versailles and left Britain out on a limb. Britain soon declared that it was a three-cornered treaty and not a two-cornered treaty that she had signed and that she could not assume the responsibility of policing the world. This left France all alone, disillusioned and disappointed, so she refused to disarm as she had agreed to do under the Treaty of Versailles. This gave Hitler a chance to say that France violated the Treaty before Germany did, which, of course, was true. France felt that she had been abandoned by her war allies and her peace allies and turned her attention toward looking for friends farther east and alliances with them. Now France has signed a treaty with Russia for mutual defense against Germany.

The story of England and Chamberlain at Munich is well remembered. Chamberlain did what he could and nobody criticized him much at the time, for many people did think that he had brought peace to the world "for our time." But the real point is that when England was on the spot against a nation that was heavily armed and ruled by a madman, there was nobody in all this wide world that would hold up his hand and say, "I am ready to go along with you." Afterwards, of course, Chamberlain was all wrong and a dear, weak, old man with an umbrella, and England had sold Czechoslovakia down the river.

America, of course, started the whole landslide against the league. We refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and the Tripartite Treaty, and abandoned our allies in both war and peace. Both political parties passed resolutions in favor of the league and the world court, but neither one of them carried through. We set up the organization for world peace and then upset it.

Besides this, our president during twelve years in office took no aggressive steps towards assisting the league. He sent delegates to the London Economic Conference and before they had time to arrive in London, sent others after them to head them off and tell them that he had changed his mind. He made a feeble attempt to go into the world court, but not enough to do any good. He sent delegates to the International Labor Organization in 1934, but from among the twenty-three conventions adopted in the last ten years only five of them have been ratified by the United States. Apparently some other league would suit many Americans as well as to go back to Geneva.

It is the business of the new council to provide for world peace and of the new assembly, together with its committees, to look after all economic, social, and cultural things. The old council was not democratic and the new council is not democratic, and the reason is that great powers do not like to give up their great power. After all, in the last analysis there is only a small measure of democracy in any of our political or economic relations, and in some of our religious and military relations no democracy at all.

No matter how they say it, it is probably true that the council will not take any action for or against any measure opposed by any one of the great powers. It is also probably true that if the Dumbarton league goes on and functions well for a considerable period of time without any severe test, the nations will become better acquainted and less suspicious of each other, the new league will grow very much stronger, and the forces of harmony and accord will greatly improve. If the time comes when the council is very nearly unanimous and if it is strong and well backed up by the assembly and the outside world, it will be a whole lot easier to get one dissenting nation to be reasonable and see the issue in a broader and more democratic light.

The new league is said to have more teeth than the former one. This is all right if the teeth are needed, but generally and, perhaps it is fair to say, in most cases it will not need to use any teeth at all. If it has the support of almost the whole world it can easily find a way to enforce its order. And there is not much to the point that Dumbarton Oaks has the right to anticipate trouble and head it off; the old league could have done that. There never was any lack of authority in the old league, it was a lack of power. Its most conspicuous example was trying to impose sanctions against Italy after her invasion of Ethiopia. The newspapers carried the headline: "Mussolini Bluffs Young Anthony Eden." The said Mussolini did not bluff Anthony Eden nor anybody else, but the trouble was that there were only a very few countries that could be counted on to stand back of the league and none of them were the large countries. They did not want to get in a position where they might have to interfere with American trade and possibly have to fight against the United States, for nobody knew or could find out where Uncle Sam stood.

Nobody claims that the new league will succeed in a big way without the support of the United States, and very few now deny that the old league would have succeeded in a big way if it had been given the support of the United States. But the choice is not between the old league and the new, it is a choice between Dumbarton Oaks and World War III. Just how strong, how fair, or how democratic the new one is, is not the issue right now. After all, the exact text is not so important; the important thing is whether the nations are going to form and support an organization for peace.

Shepherdess of Dreams

At dawn she shepherds all her gentle flock
Of lambs, her dreams and guides them through the night
That none shall meet with fear or earthly shock.
At dawn she shepherds all her gentle flock.
Though lost, a lamb had strayed upon a rock,
Returning home, it gave her faith delight.
At dawn she shepherds all her gentle flock
Of lambs, her dreams and guides them through the night.

She gives a lamb in black her special care.
It is a fragile dream that will be true,
For she will heal its faults with instant prayer.
She gives a lamb in black her special care,
And hourly love. She hums a joyful air,
A song for lambs, her charming retinue,
She gives a lamb in black her special care
It is a fragile dream that will be true.

JANE RAWLINS SHEEAN.

Which Kind of Christianity at the Peace Table?

JOHN MALICK

Among the blueprints for post-war time are those of a number of blocs of considerable size. We try to get their import and are gratified with much that they say. We naturally fall into blocs, in politics: Farm, Dairy, Silver, Poll Tax, Labor, Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturers' Association, and the American Legion. Then there are a number of colored, and some bloody, shirt blocs.

Now a bloc obviously is for something—a lot of people for something. As things go, we should not be surprised to find that they are for something for themselves, and that would not condemn them. We live in a bloc era, at the beginning of it. For the first time it can shout its special line around the world. Voices that before would have died out in the home burg, now may speak to all the earth.

In any bloc, one knowing his world naturally would be looking for a blend of self-seeking and selflessness. Self-seeking now has to be carefully overlaid. A bloc cannot get far now with the bald statement, "We are out for our crowd and we do not care who knows it." It has to have a setting of idealism, words that mean that. Whatever a bloc is about, up to, out for, now it has to have a front of nice sounding phrases, as all the uplift people in *Gideon Planish* do.

Take the gross volume of activities by blocs; break it down into social assets and liabilities. What is the net for the common good? Some appraisers, looking them all over today, the big, brutal and the lesser ones, say: Organized bodies of opinion of any kind are a menace to the state, and that runs from the massacre of St. Bartholomew, by an ecclesiastical bloc, to Jewish atrocities, by a political bloc. That is pretty sweeping, but when we look over the martyr list, all the pressures on minorities, ask the why of the Reformations and Revolutions, why people cross the Atlantic, what they are getting away from, when we remember all this, one might ask the question, and have a lot of trouble answering, "Are organized bodies of opinion a menace to the common weal?"

The largest blocs so far have been about "religion." That is the word used. Religionists made the first aggregations. Likely we should not use bloc in this connection now. In the strict sense a "religious person," really that, would not be a menace in a bloc or out. Taking religion as the name of that reaction inside to all the forces in the universe playing upon one, plus the way of dealing with people always for their good, then being a menace in one's religion would not make sense. The proper analogy seems to be a person in love with a person, or with the universe, God, if one can feel it is lovable. People never have been afraid of the great religionists alone or in blocs. Seldom have there been that many around at one time or in one place. "Religion" ought to be kept for them.

There are other words for religionists getting together, which are more in keeping with the purposes for which they usually get together. There is the word "Theology," what is worked out to say. Then there is "Ecclesiasticism," their setup, lands, buildings for housing and dispensing the theology, and making some impact upon the world.

It is obvious that there could be theological and ecclesiastical blocs, while in the strict sense there could not be a religious bloc. Pressure can be put upon people,—say to them, "Do this, believe this or else," but such pressure could not make one love somebody, any more than telling Tom to love Mary would make it so. Religion is as intangible and unreachable by blocs or pressures as that. Tom and Mary know this too well to try, knowing the futility of it, as all the great religionists know it. Theological and ecclesiastical blocs might come within the rule that organized bodies of opinion, even about God, are a menace. There is a lot of history about people trying to get out from under just such blocs and of breaking them up: the history of Henry VIII, Calvinism, the Reformation, and Puritanism, all trying to get bodies and minds out of blocs. The normal so far is getting out of one bloc into another. We are still trying to get our education, culture, drama, all the arts, and marriage laws out from under them.

We have some theological and ecclesiastical blocs of considerable size, some of them, most of them, earth-wide in their ambition, out to take the world, that much range. All these groups are made up of people, just people, and in different degrees of religious people. Groups that have 90 percent of Italy or of Utah, naturally, just in the law of average, would have religious people in them. Then one-half the population in this country, not in these blocs, likely would have about the same percent religious. There are no statistics.

It is natural, and to be expected, that these theological and ecclesiastical blocs would have their blueprints for the future. Their business is dealing in long futures and it is natural enough for them to deal in the shorter futures on their way to their longest one. The Chamber of Commerce, the labor groups, and what not, all have their blueprints. It is to be expected that there would be a Vatican plan for the world. It always has had a plan for it, being the long range planner of the Western Hemisphere, looking ahead by centuries as others look forward to, and measure steps by, Administrations. Naturally there would be the Federal Council of Churches, Jewish groups, Y's, and all the rest.

We are thinking of these groups all saying that now is the time for them to step in, gather up the pieces and shape them to their hearts' desire, which is to make them all "Christian." The way it is said is that we must have a Christian civilization, industry, education, and Christian everything else, not just for ourselves but for the world, a large order. "Christ is the answer for the world," is the blueprint for Russia, Asia, Africa, all over. Whether these blocs can sit at the Peace Table is not certain. Most of them have no territory over which they rule in a temporal way, and most have no standing as departments of state, as in England and old Russia.

The Federal Council is the Protestant pool, not of all but of most. They put out a lot of material that we are glad to have. We circulate some of it dealing with non-theological matters. The Federal Council names its minimum belief:

> The first task of the Christian church is to bring more persons to subject their lives to the will of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. Here is the source of moral judgment on the issues of the war. Only if the Christian churches build a spiritual foundation, will this nation pursue righteous policies.

Would all say it this way or mean that? Would all who want the best for this country and for the world, and are willing to pay for it, say it this way, or any-

thing like it, "subject their lives to the Will of God as revealed in Jesus Christ?" Whatever that means, with two unknown quantities and highly disputable speculations in it, would the Jewish people say it that way? Would one-third, or maybe one-half, of the people in this country say it this way? This being a World War, the blueprint of the world after the war has to be commensurate, for the world. Would Russia say it this way, or China? There are large tracts of the world, with most of the human race in them, would they say it this way, that the task is to bring more persons to subject their lives to the will of God as revealed in Jesus Christ?

There are other lines of speculation about persons through whom this Will of God is revealed. They are going to be at the Peace Table. We have to live with them after the war to keep a world, as we have had to work with them to win the war. Millions over the earth, likely as religious as any, would agree that we should deepen the spiritual foundation, whatever that means in their particular part of the world. Some of these religionists have been working at this, really working at it, for more centuries than there has been a Christian interpretation. To make one person, of one religion, next to the last of the historical ones, the whole spiritual foundation, and to get the World Will through that person alone, would seem to them like making a bottleneck for that Will which is said to be without limit.

"Christian" happens to be a blanket word. Those who know about such things list eight or ten meanings of it. For one, it is a word of complimentary import. We say, "He is a Christian man," which might mean no more than that he is a kindly person, of Golden Rule integrity. This does not mean to say a word about the theological or ecclesiastical bloc to which he belongs; likely, he does not belong to any. It is said without knowing what church he is in or knowing that he is not in any. It is said even of Jewish people and of Ethical Culturists; said even of those of the old, bad names, agnostic, infidel, and the rest.

It is said that ours is a "Christian civilization," which is accurate enough. The word is properly used that way. We have grown up in a culture in which the Christian point of view has predominated. Most have not known even the name of any other religion except to condemn it. In like manner, other people have grown up in a Confucian, Buddhist, or Moslem civilization, whether they believe or even know the doctrines or not. Taken in this sense even anti-clericals acknowledge that they are in a Christian country.

Then there is the regular use of the word to name a system of thought based upon certain speculations about events and persons, what they are said to mean and to have done in the way of alleviating man's condition. It is the formula of helpless man, the seed of death in him, no escape by himself or through his kind, all as helpless as himself. It is the formula, among theological formulae, of one immortal being in a world of men not immortal. This was the bid of different religions competing in Rome when Christianity was new. Christianity won in that competition.

One may say, and properly, that this is the Christian form of religion and that it should have the name, so that it may be known that it is just this, and no less, that one believes when he says, "I am a Christian." It would be very much better for all not holding this to take some other name. That would make for clarity, identity between word and meaning, no meaning hanging over the edge of the word, no margin of word hanging over the edge of the meaning, as definite as in the exact sciences.

In naming what Christianity is there are two parts different in kind but said to be inextricably linked. One part purports to be just historical events of the kind that one could have seen if he had been there: a birth, a living person, a death, a resurrection, and an ascension. One event is listed to come later. Another part of it is purely speculation, from the masters of speculation so far, Jew and Greek, about what these historical events and this person mean. Not all of this speculation appears in the record about the historical events and the person, but from the written record, plus unwritten tradition, it is said that it may be gathered that Christianity is just this.

The church has a minimum of belief which gives the right to take the Christian name. This is the system from Fall to Return, each part growing out of what came before and determining what comes after. It is indivisible, has to be taken as a whole. Disbelief about any one part nullifies the efficacy of the whole. In popular use, another minimum has grown up claiming that it has enough to get in under the Christian name without stretching it too much. This minimum says, "Brotherhood of Man and Fatherhood of God," and that these are enough. While these words do not appear in the record in this form, it is said that they embody all that matters. We pass that this minimum leaves out some other things quite different in the New Testament account that are much easier to leave out than to explain away. There is this new minimum of belief that likes to call itself Christian. A lot of people now say Brotherhood, Fatherhood, and usually include Democracy, and say that they are Christian in this way. They mean this much and no more. The Founding Fathers of the church and the Keepers of the Faith once delivered, would say that this is not Christianity and never was.

While all this has been going on, other parts of the world have been going along, too. They use other words, have other gods of other names. They, too, have moved along by centuries. With another background they have reached a minimum which is spread about among the people of their countries. What has come to be good Christianity with us has come to be good Hinduism, Buddhism, or whatever they have. What has come to be good religion, as what has come to be good science, is so much the same the world around that people from all countries now can come together and speak their common thought. In certain life fundamentals those of the same levels are one, always have been one, as the lower stages of religion always have been alike the world around.

Other religionists, too, have been through their wars of jealous gods, have had their magic, mythology, revelations, their truth tangled in superstition, adorned with pageantry and ritual. They all have felt the impact of the new science, technology, and social order. Now we are together with all of them in a new way, likely never to be separated again. "Is there to be one heart for the whole globe?" Whitman asked. And all the religions at their latest best ask "Will it be a new heart?"

There is certain advantage in fraternizing with the Orient in these matters. Whether their conviction is more or less, their ecclesiastical manners are better.

They take on other religions much more gracefully than we do. We are of the tradition that makes a clean sweep of the old gods. When the contest is over the new god has the field and all the old ones are liquidated. In the Orient they do not kill them off; say that the old must have helped somebody, and that to destroy it might hurt those who had been helped. So they incorporate the old, take the best of the new, make religion an eclectic thing. We would not work their gods in with ours but they would work ours in with theirs. They have done it many times before and the results have not been as bad as was feared. They are taking ours; we are beginning to take theirs.

The kind of Christianity that could sit down at the Peace Table, keeping its convictions as well as its self-respect, is this kind that we have named, the belief in a few old, well-tried ways, easy for the lips but always very hard to do. Toward this the world is tending. There could be one voice on the things upon which religions are one, this new minimum for Christianity and for them, whatever the name, and it is enough for the healing of the nations.

Adventures in the Realm of Ideas

VICTOR S. YARROS

To die ignorant, said Carlyle, that is the real tragedy. To live without what the Germans call a *Weltanschauung*—a philosophy of the world and our place in it—is just as tragic. Life without ideals and general ideas is certainly not abundant: it is drab, trivial, petty, almost sub-human. This is why John Morley advised young people to attach themselves as early as possible to a cause or movement worthy of the deepest devotion. Spinoza, long before, had given the same advice.

Ideas evolve. Philosophies grow and undergo modifications, but in my case, at any rate, the same essential philosophy has been operative and dominant all through a long life.

At the age of seventeen, I was drawn into the Russian revolutionary movement, joining a provincial branch of the party which had for its slogan, "Land and liberty"—land for the peasants, liberty for all. We regarded ourselves as Socialists in economics and liberals in politics. We worked for the Four Freedoms. We read forbidden, underground literature and knew the elements of Socialism as expounded by Fourier and Marx. We leaned toward Marxism, as it seemed less Utopian and more scientific.

Two years later, in America, under the influence of Bakunin, Kropotkin, Reclus, Most, and others, whose books and pamphlets criticized Marx and emphasized libertarianism, I became a Communist-Anarchist, though Communism was only an ideal. The nearer goal was Socialism, but Socialism *without the State*. Statism was "the enemy." Since power corrupts, a strong state meant a tyrannical and corrupt state. Hence society was conceived in terms of free, autonomous, and federated communes.

Five years later, meantime having studied Mill and Spencer, I was attracted by the so-called Boston School of Pacific and Philosophical Anarchism. This school stood for the gradual *abolition* of the State, its definition of the term State being aggression upon the non-consenting, non-invasive individual who fully respected the equal liberty of others but demanded recognition of his right to ignore the government, to refuse to pay taxes, or to perform military service, except on a strictly voluntary basis so far as he was concerned. These ideas were in part Spencerian and in part Proudhonian. They were described as unterrified Jeffersonian democracy and consistent, logical Individualism as taught by Thoreau and Emerson.

The individual, according to this school, was the sovereign, and not any accidental majority. Majority rule, it held, was as vicious and irrational as minority rule or the rule of an autocrat or oligarch. In the words of Proudhon, order was "the daughter, not the mother, of liberty," and social cooperation in a variety of desirable and proper forms could best be developed without any element of compulsion. People, the argument ran, were reasonable enough to work together for such ends as police and fire protection, traffic regulation, flood control, sanitation and hygiene, and the like, and also reasonable enough to pay fair rates for such services. The systems of voluntary insurance were striking instances of cooperation without compulsion, and these systems were capable of indefinite expansion.

The Boston Anarchists were opposed to violence and advocated passive resistance to the exactions and encroachments of the State. They proposed strikes against taxes and against rent. They favored propaganda by such strictly passive methods, including going to prison for violations of the laws they condemned on moral or practical grounds.

In their economic teachings the Anarchists were Marxists. They considered, with Marx, interest, rent, and profits as forms of surplus value, or plain robbery sanctioned by plutocratic lawmakers. In politics, they followed Proudhon and the Syndicalists, boycotting elections and the ballot boxes.

Here was an appealing and logically unassailable gospel. Its lineage was distinguished, its chief apostles, past and present, were intellectual and moral giants. For nearly two decades I actively preached this consistent, lofty gospel. Then doubts and misgivings began to trouble me. Logic is no test of truth. Life is not a laboratory. Human nature is not simple. Progress is not certain, steady, uninterrupted. Is not Philosophical Anarchism *too* logical? Does it not rest on dubious assumptions concerning human nature and human conduct? Are men always reasonable, and is it possible for order, justice, and progress to dispense entirely with the element of compulsion or coercion? Men are not wholly selfish, but are they not selfish enough to evade responsibilities and obligations imposed not arbitrarily by other men but by the very conditions of life in society, a nation, a federated commonwealth? Can the majority in any community be expected to tolerate non-cooperation on the part of obstinate, perverse, recalcitrant minorities and confer substantial benefits on them without obtaining any return? An individual may be non-invasive and yet thoroughly unsocial, parasitic, undesirable. What community would permit him to indulge his notions of an ideal State?

Granted that some day, in the distant future, a society *may* come into existence which will fulfill that exalted ideal, the ideal of complete, voluntary altruism, what relevance has that remote possibility to the needs, problems, and burdens of our time and our imperfect society? The Philosophical Anarchists forgot the present and dwelt mentally in a theoretical future. They reckoned without time, space, and circumstances.

True, if this was pointed out to them, they assured you that they were *not* Utopians; that they knew very well that progress toward their goal would be slow, perhaps very slow; and that they rejoiced in small steps toward their goal. For example, they believed in free trade but realized that the masses were opposed to that policy, and therefore they would welcome moderate reductions of protective duties. Again, they believed in free banking but knew that they could not prevail upon any congress to repeal *all* the restrictions upon banking and, therefore, would be grateful for the repeal of the high tax on notes issued by state banks. They believed in private police systems, but admitted that the police function of government would be the last to go in favor of privately supported police forces, and meantime they were willing to pay taxes calculated to maintain an efficient police system.

These, of course, were sensible compromises with necessity. But the Philosophical Anarchists insisted that no measure be passed which in any degree *extended* the sphere of government or compulsion. Thus they objected to laws favoring trade unions, to laws shortening the hours of labor, regulating wages, or protective of women and children. These statutes were paternalistic and tended to intrench and strengthen the State. The slogan, they held, should be repeal, repeal and repeal; reduce government to a minimum. This attitude, far from being progressive, was in effect utterly reactionary. It played into the hands of the Bourbons and Tories. It gave aid and comfort to plutocracy. It was severely logical, at first sight, but it was not rational.

As a matter of fact, too often the defenders of plutocracy and monopoly have talked and written exactly as the Anarchists have. The plutocrats hate government when it makes too many concessions to labor or to progressivism, or undertakes to curb greed and tyranny on the part of capital and finance. To special privilege, of which capital and Big Business are the beneficiaries, there is never any objection from that quarter.

The principal mistake made by the Anarchists was in their treatment of the State as such. They held, with Spencer, that the State was "conceived in aggression and maintained by aggression." If the State was a class institution, and the government was, as Marx put it, "the executive committee of the ruling clique," then, clearly, no good could ever be expected of it. But, whatever the *origin* of the State, it was absurd to assert that it was always and inevitably the instrument of privilege and monopoly, and must remain such under all conditions. The evidence glaringly contradicted that conception. The democratic governments have increasingly yielded to the pressure of farmers, wage workers, and middle-class reformers.

The hatred of our plutocrats and reactionaries for the New Deal is alone sufficient to dispose of the charge that the State is simply the tool of the economic oligarchy. In the past, the same interests bitterly fought Woodrow Wilson's reform program, and fought in vain. Under Cleveland the same interests were denounced by the President as "the communism of pelf" and in several clashes between the government and Big Business the latter suffered reverses and the cause of democracy scored victories. In short, the Marxian idea of the State was never valid, and in recent decades its arbitrary and fallacious character has been repeatedly demonstrated.

Where democracy is strong and mature, the State serves the interests of the masses, not of the classes. There is no reason to fear that this trend will be reversed in the future. Social and economic reforms demanded by an alert and intelligent electorate will be achieved through the State, despite the rage and clamor of the economic Tories.

These considerations and facts have radically altered the attitude of many former Anarchists toward legislation, the ballot box, and democratic government. These thinkers are fighting *plutocracy,* not the State, and are working for substantial reforms in the existing system side by side with Socialists, advanced liberals, and Communists of the evolutionary school. Some of them, like this writer, call themselves Democratic Collectivists and Humanists. They are not indifferent to liberty, but they do not agree with the timid and doctrinaire liberals who tell us that more collectivism means less freedom for labor and the individual citizen. Government acquisition and operation of the public utilities and essential industries need not entail intellectual slavery or suppression of civil rights and freedom. The State as employer, it must be recognized, is not as a rule more benevolent than a corporation for profit, or a private monopoly, but means and techniques have been devised—and more are sure to be devised with the accumulation of knowledge and experience—with the definite view of preventing government despotism, bureaucratic arrogance and conservatism, and resistance to new ideas. The opponents of more collectivism in industry and commerce have not evinced proper appreciation or comprehension of the important new techniques of modern democracy. They are too prejudiced to draw the right inferences from the remarkable success of the T.V.A., for example. Fear and dislike of bureaucracy and centralization prevent clear thinking on the vital question: How can we use government in new, constructive, and socially beneficial ways without inviting the abuses and evils long associated with dictatorships, military cabals, oligarchies, and aristocracies? Power *is* dangerous—but so is freedom, so is religion, so is virtue.

It has been apparent for many decades that the capitalistic order is breaking down, and that the next order, after the destruction of the malignant and utterly dishonest and savage substitutes for order, namely, Nazism and Fascism, will be largely socialist in essence and principle. Democratic Collectivism has evolved in the course of the last quarter of a century in response to the demand for a system designed to promote economic security and economic prosperity *without* sacrificing liberty and human dignity. The solution is not complete, but it is infinitely superior to any other proposed and advocated by conservatives, *laissez-faire* liberals, or orthodox Socialists. Take the position of those who favor what they call the mixed economic system, a system in which free, competitive enterprise flourishes side by side with regulated public utilities, state-operated industries, cooperative plants, and the like. In England, the same school uses the phrase "half-way house" for this sort of system, to distinguish it from total, or 100 per cent,

Socialism. The mixed economic system, the argument is, will preserve the freedoms we cherish and serve as a check on the ambitious and power-drunk state. But just how much free enterprise is requisite for the end and purpose in view? No one suggests a ratio or limit. Would 20 per cent free and competitive enterprise do? Would 40 per cent be sufficient? Again, little has been said or written about the giant corporations, or near-monopolies, which have not been regulated or controlled in the past, and which often defy the government and force it to deal with them on their terms. There are many such powerful monopolies in the highly industrialized countries, and particularly in the United States. "Little" business is dominated by them and obeys orders from them. The traditional legislation against monopolies has notoriously failed to arrest their growth or seriously affect their policies toward labor, production, quality of product, or patent manipulation.

Finally, as to the public utilities so-called. We are supposed to control and regulate these natural monopolies. Is the control effective and the regulation real and adequate? No independent or progressive governor of any of our states would answer this query in the affirmative. When Franklin D. Roosevelt was governor of New York he found the control nominal and illusory. He urged more and better control, but the legislature paid no heed to him. Many of the lawmakers were, had been, or expected to be, employes of these utilities. The corporation lawyers opposed further legislation in the interest of the consumers, of labor, or of the small investors. Regulation by means of lawsuits is a mockery and a snare. The utilities and the corporations spend millions where the states or the Federal government can spend thousands. Delays, trials, appeals, obstructive tactics, technicalities, consent decrees honored in the breach, all these devices and stratagems, familiar to intelligent newspaper readers, practically nullify the statutes enacted since the late eighties of the last century at the demand of the public for protection against the exactions and abuses of monopoly. The champions of the half-way house, therefore, are champions of half-hearted, futile half-way measures instead of vigorous, radical, and well-conceived measures designed to curb monopoly.

Another major depression entailing unemployment for millions of men and women able and anxious to work and produce would cause the collapse of our system. Even the industrialists and financiers know and say that this is morally certain. In that event little will be heard about a permanent half-way economic house, or mixed system. It is wiser to plan now to avert a catastrophic crisis and proceed to build a sound and stable system on a basis of justice, reason, and democracy. Is there any alternative to Democratic Collectivism? If there is, the engineers, the scientific economists, the progressive managers should be challenged to present that alternative. There was, indeed, a period during which an American school of thought, namely that of Henry George, asserted that its middle-way solution happily reconciled freedom and security, individualism and reasonable equality. The one tax on land values, values attributable to social progress, or growth of population and industry, was to cure all our economic ills—abolish unemployment and poverty, restore opportunity, prevent gross and harmful inequalities in income and fortunes, and render socialist regimentation totally unnecessary. Some small groups may still cling to that notion. But the Single Tax movement is dead beyond resurrection. Monopoly, finance-capitalism, the giant corporations, technological developments have killed it. Land is important, and monopoly in it will have to be done away with, preferably through a tenure based strictly on occupying ownership and proper cultivation. But no form of taxation will solve our financial and economic problems. There is no panacea, no single, simple remedy for our economic, political, and social ills.

Whether or not we are taking to heart, collectively, the lessons of the past thirty years and are resolved to attack our problems—which are also world problems—with boldness, vision, method, sincerity, remains to be seen. If the reactionaries, the shortsighted men of affairs, and the partisan politicians have their way, we shall once more limit ourselves to makeshifts, quarter-measures, treatment of symptoms, and thus invite disaster. There can be no enduring and sound peace under economic chaos and violent civil conflict. International problems cannot be solved if internal economic and political problems of the gravest character remain unsolved. If, then, our civilization is to be saved and revitalized, we must seek peace at home and abroad in Democratic Collectivism or liberal Socialism. The Communists, the Syndicalists, and the Philosophical Anarchists must renounce their respective Utopian goals and resolve to work together for a feasible, attainable, reasonably satisfactory system. Nineteenth century movements have historical significance. We live in the middle of the twentieth century, and our age has its own climate of opinion and its own plans and techniques.

Beneficence of Death

Throughout the world, through the centuries, men have known him. The millions who have met him are unable to describe him, but those who have watched him at work have agreed that his ministrations are ever kind and gentle. They tell that he causes no pain, and although dreaded and shunned till the moment of his coming, he is unfailingly met with welcome when at last he does arrive.

And yet he is humble. He knows that the relief which he can give will be lasting, but he stands aside, while others try to alleviate suffering. Only when all the rest have failed, does he come forward.

To the aged, he is a true friend; so, too, to the weary in mind and spirit. To those in agony he brings permanent surcease. The young he seeks to avoid, but when the call is urgent he responds, lest his failure to do so mean unhappiness for years and years to come.

He is present in times of famine and disaster, and on the battlefields of war. Such situations are not of his making, but without him anguish would be intolerable.

He is aware that he leaves broken hearts in his wake, but he must not heed the cries. It is to those who have summoned him that he must administer his blessed service.

He plays an important role in the wondrous scheme of things. Without him there would be no room for rebirth and growth; for new hopes and plans; for striving for a better world.

His name? Yes, it is Death—not cruel and cold and ugly, but kind and warm and beautiful.

ADELINE RIES

The Study Table

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Great Poems

IN THIS OUR DAY. *By Edith Lovejoy Pierce. New York: Harper & Brothers. 71 pp. $1.50.*

It is a shame to characterize one poet in terms of another, especially a poet as distinctively individual as Mrs. Pierce. Yet we speak of Samuel Johnson as being of the school of Alexander Pope, we match Keats and Tennyson, and we describe Whittier as "the American Burns." The comparisons, of course, are woefully inadequate, and yet they are accurate as far as they go. And so is it accurate, if not adequate, to say that Mrs. Pierce is a later Emily Dickinson. The amazing concision of thought and expression, the tense poignancy of sentiment, the power of phrase that opens vistas of vision and plumbs depths of philosophy and religion, and the pity for life's tragedy—these are all present in the one poet as in the other. As one reads these brief poems, each a few lines of tremendous content, one is inevitably reminded of the immortal Emily. Yet is Mrs. Pierce her own true self. Her poetry, like her personality, is unique.

An Englishwoman by birth, she has traveled much in Europe as a student of languages and music. Coming to this country in 1929, on the occasion of her marriage, she began to write, and in recent years has published more than three hundred poems in magazines, religious journals (including UNITY), and anthologies. She has achieved proud recognition among her fellow-craftsmen, and has swiftly won public acclaim. *In This Our Day,* her first volume of poetry, establishes her among the outstanding poets of America.

Awareness of the deep things of life, a keen sensitivity to beauty, firm, bold thought, and a soul wrung with anguish for this hour, are the outstanding characteristics of this book. These are all made manifest in the sonnet with which Mrs. Pierce wisely opens her collection of poems. Here are time and eternity, and the heart of the poet rent between them:

> "Nothing I now can do to force the bloom
> From this constricted grain of song I hold.
> No light can dissipate the common gloom,
> No warmth prevail against the general cold.
> The bellows of my lungs will not suffice
> To fan this mighty mote of life to flower:
> This is the era of impending ice,
> The winter of the spirit has its hour.
> This germ I now commit for burial
> To the kind earth no shrunken seedling spurning
> That, through a fierce and frosty interval,
> Keeps faith in sunlight and in heat returning.
> The seed is here, my heartache to assuage.
> The flower belongs to some far distant age."

Mrs. Pierce divides the content of her book under four separate headings: "My Hand Is Writing," "The Ever-Fixed Mark," "The Darkling Plain," and "On Earth As It Is In Heaven." In the first two sections are pieces of a more personal nature. The third section drops down the dread shadow of the war. The winter is upon us, and,

> "No date is set for spring."

This season of new life will come again—

> "Some day the earth may once again be fair
> Peace may return. But they shall not be here."

The dead, the myriad dead! And those who live, how shall they forget what they have seen?

> "In war
> The water-line is lowered.
> In the fierce drought
> The level sinks.
> Now appear
> Foul, drying slimes, * * *
> Wedged broken glass
> And rusted iron pipes.
>
> In war
> Nothing is changed,
> But everything revealed.
> Though peace return
> And cover ugliness
> With a smooth amethyst plaque
> Of evening water
> How shall we forget
> What we have seen?"

But Mrs. Pierce is seer as well as poet. Her soul will not be conquered. In her last section, she beholds her "Apocalypse."

> "God is coming!
> Hear the wind of his spirit
> Rushing through the upper reaches of the mind."

Here are lovely poems, radiant with the light of faith. Among others are some of the most exquisite Christmas pieces I have ever read. One is impressed, as one reaches the end, by this poet's command of her art. She can write masterful free verse, sing a charming lyric, and compose a flawless sonnet. And always is there a fine mind attuned to a noble spirit.

The book has been published in beautiful form. Paper, type, design are all as they should be. The dedication is appropriately to "Toyohiko Kagawa, Poet and Saint."

Understanding One Another

ONE GOD: THE WAYS WE WORSHIP HIM. *By Florence Mary Fitch. New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Co. 144 pp. $2.00.*

This book is one of those things that seem too good to be true. Starting out with the cry of the prophet, "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?", the author undertakes to present and interpret, by text and picture, how Jews, Catholics, and Protestants worship God.

The first third of the book is concerned with the Jews, as members of our oldest religious faith. Here, in a text of utter clarity and simple beauty, is told the story of Israel and of the practices of praise and adoration which constitute the observance of the religion of Israel: The Sabbath, the Torah and the Ark, Bar Mitzvah, the tephillin and talith, the high holy days, the synagogue and its services, the school and its learning, conservative and reformed Jews—all these features of the Jewish religion are sympathetically described and faithfully interpreted. What the text does not and cannot do is done by pictures of startling vividness and beauty. Here are Jewish men and women, and especially lovely children, absorbed in the practices of their faith. How it touches the heart to see these ancient ways of Israel still surviving triumphantly in our own time!

Eagerly we scan the pages—and suddenly, on page 58, find ourselves looking at a superb picture of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, and on page 62 at a picture of the Vatican. The turn of the Roman Catholic has come—and now, for more than thirty handsome pages,

we are introduced to the great dogmas and ceremonies of the most ancient Christian Church. The seven sacraments of the Church, the rearing of children from baptism to confirmation, the confessional, the mass, the high altar in the cathedral, the holy orders and the hierarchy, feast days and saints days—all these are explained, with pictures chosen with sensitive skill to show the inner life as well as the outer ritual of Rome.

Then comes Protestantism which scorns uniformity, and thus has many churches. The history and doctrines of Protestantism are stated, the various types of church buildings and services described, the place of the Bible made plain, the Friends or Quakers given an especial mention, and all illustrated by pictures so splendid as to lift the heart. If there was ever a better church photograph than "the family pew" (page 125), I have not seen it.

This book is an adventure in interfaith understanding and good will. Conceived and achieved as a labor of love, it is altogether the finest contribution to the work of tolerance in our time. A generation taught these pages would end bigotry and hate forever.

Comment

In a recent issue of the *New York Times Book Review,* the Editor, Mr. J. Donald Adams, makes sage comment on a certain aspect of our contemporary literature. He writes:

> One doubts if any other literature can count as many abortive or truncated careers among its novelists as our own. Our literary history of the last few decades is strewn with the wrecks of talent and genius. Seldom has there been a steady growth. . .

What Mr. Adams has in mind is the fact that our writers have no sustained fount of inspiration. They do not expand through the years with ever greater maturity and power. On the contrary, they either run dry and disappear, or feebly repeat themselves, or else decline into work of a markedly inferior type. Most of our authors seem to have in them only one or two books. Those books written, they are done! Mr. Adams says:

> It would be depressing to count the number of young men who have produced a promising book or two and then fallen silent, and the number who have gone on, caught in the morass of their own confusion—the Sherwood Andersons, the Faulkners, the Thomas Wolfes.

This statement chances to have a peculiar pertinency for me, as during the summer of 1944 I read a number of the classic novels of the last century and more—the works of Scott, Dickens, George Eliot, and the like. As I read these books and renewed my old delight in them, I was impressed afresh by their inexhaustible vitality. With what gusto these authors wrote, with what exuberance of mind and spirit, with what sure mastery of their craft! Their activity in literature is like the flowing of a great river, laden with the freightage of a continent. Did these men never grow tired; did their enthusiasm never wane; did their sources of inspiration never become clogged or dry? Not so far as their readers can discover! These authors did better or worse work from time to time—they did not always measure up to their own highest standard. But the light within them did not fail. It burned to the end with an inextinguishable flame.

Take Sir Walter Scott, for example! He published *Waverley,* the first of the immortal Waverley Series, in 1814. At that time he had already written the famous poems which rank him among the great poets of English literature. The last of the Waverley novels, *Castle Dangerous,* produced under conditions of pitifully broken health, was published in 1832. In this brief span of eighteen years, Scott wrote, in addition to much other work, twenty-six novels, ten or a dozen of which rank among the great novels of all time. One of the best of the series, *Redgauntlet,* was published late, in 1824, and is number nineteen in order. One has the feeling that had not his body given way in his late fifties, Scott could have gone on forever. At no time was there any sign of failing energy. Scott's great fault was that he wrote too much and too carelessly—but this is itself a sign of the vast flood of invention and inspiration that was loose within him.

Charles Dickens is another example. The flow of his stupendous novels, the originality and multiplicity of their characters, the sheer triumphant energy of their performance, are things to stir the heart, like the passing of a great procession. Between 1836 and 1870, Dickens wrote twenty stories and novels, most of them three volumes in length, and a majority of them among the enduring literary masterpieces of his age. One of the greatest of these novels, *Our Mutual Friend,* came late, in 1865. When Dickens died, he was working on *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* which, in its unfinished state, promised to be one of the greatest of the author's books. There was no limit to what this man could do. He was as inexhaustible as his readers, who devoured eagerly every word he wrote.

What was true of Scott and Dickens was true as well of Thackeray, Charles Reade, Thomas Hardy, George Meredith, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, and of Dumas, Hugo, Balzac, George Sand, Leo Tolstoi, and of such a giant in our own time as Thomas Mann. One has only to run over such names to appreciate the full force of Donald Adams' complaint about our writers here in America today. What is the matter with our authors? Are they a feeble tribe? Do they lack some sustenance our society does not supply? Are they exhausted by the turmoils and terrors of the time? Something is wrong—especially as it was not always so in this country. Washington Irving, James Fenimore Cooper, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Edgar Allen Poe, Mark Twain, William Dean Howells, these also had perennial springs. But such are with us no longer. Perhaps this is not a literary age. Or perhaps this waning vitality is a part of that decline of a civilization which is so ominously suggested by the wars and revolutions of this century.

Books Received

In His Own Words. *By Eduard Benes. Published by the Czech-American National Alliance, 24-37 Thirty-second Street, Long Island City 2, N. Y. 136 pp.*

Know Your Enemy! *By T. H. Tetens. (Preface by Emil Ludwig.) Published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York City. 127 pp.*

The Power of Non-Violence. *By Richard Gregg. (Revised Edition.) Published by Fellowship Publications, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y. 253 pp. $1.50.*

Private Smith's Return. *By Manfred Carter. Published by Wagon & Star Publishers, Box 1005, Reno, Nevada. 50 cents.*

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

BRAGG HEADS MISSION TO ITALY

Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, minister of the Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, is now on the way to Italy to make arrangements for the coming of the medical mission sponsored by the Unitarian Service Committee. Dr. Morris Vischer, of Minneapolis, and Dr. E. L. Sevringhaus, of Madison, will head the medical staffs. The mission will have sixteen medical and dietetic specialists including the Director of Public Health of New York City.

This mission, planned and sponsored by the Unitarian Service Committee, goes to Italy as a unit of UNRRA and will work in close cooperation with the United States Army and the Italian Government. Mr. Bragg will be the liaison officer.

The Service Committee purchased a car for the mission. It was started on its way some time before the mission left the country.

The purpose of the mission is to study the effects of prolonged malnutrition and to discover medical and dietetic means of restoring the physical and mental efficiency of starvation victims in occupied areas of the war. The work which is now being undertaken is the result of nearly two years of planning by the Service Committee and UNRRA under the leadership of Mr. Bragg.

OPPOSE RELEASED TIME

Eight Illinois Unitarian ministers were among the signers of a letter sent out by the Chicago Action Council in opposition to the Released Time program for teaching sectarian religious education during public school hours. The letter was sent to several thousand ministers and community leaders throughout Illinois. Those who were asked to sign the letter and did sign were William J. Arms, Peoria; John N. Booth, Evanston; Homer A. Jack, Chicago; G. Richard Kuch, Rockford; Robert M. Pratt, Quincy; Philip Schug, Urbana; and Gerald F. Weary, Bloomington. Randall S. Hilton signed as Chairman of the Committee for the study of Released Time proposals of the Chicago Action Council.

The article by Gerald Weary which appeared in the *Journal of Liberal Religion* on the subject of Released Time has had great influence among those who are concerned with this problem.

Among other signers of the letter were Dr. Ernest J. Chave, Professor of Religious Education at the University of Chicago, and Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein, President of the Chicago Rabbinical Association.

Through the cooperation of Philip Schug a party has been found who is willing to bring suit to test the legality of the practice now used by some public schools in permitting sectarian religious education to be taught on public school time.

The committee makes it clear that it is not opposed to the teaching of ethics, morals, and universal religious principles to our young people as a part of the school curriculum but is opposed to the divisiveness of sectarian interpretations.

UNITARIANS SUPPORT F.E.P.C.

Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, Mrs. Martha Fletcher, Associate Director of the Unitarian Youth Commission, and Mr. Arnold Westwood, Chairman of the Social Action Committee of the A. U. Y., all made statements at the legislative hearing on the Fair Employment Practice Act now pending before the Massachusetts legislature. Their statements were in support of the measure and were widely quoted in the Boston papers.

The American Unitarian Association is officially on record in approving and supporting the Fair Employment Practice Commission and has been officially represented at congressional hearings. Several ministers in the Chicago area have come out specifically for Senate Bill 101 and in opposition to the substitute bill offered by Senator Taft which removes all enforcement clauses and makes the measure purely voluntary and thus a meaningless expression of good intention.

MAY MEETINGS PRO FORMA

The Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association which is always held in Boston during the third week in May will be only a *pro forma* session this year. While the Office of Defense Transportation granted permission to the Association to hold its annual meetings, the Board of Directors voted not to hold them except for a purely legal session to be held on Thursday morning, May 24. The election of officers will be conducted by mail balloting. Reports, the Annual Sermon, and the Ware Lecture will be printed for general distribution.

The Executive Committee of the Board is now making plans for taking the May Meetings to the churches. Some regional meetings will be held and all the churches will be asked to unite in the observance of Anniversary Sunday.

WESTERN CONFERENCE MEETINGS

With the cancellation of the May Meetings in Boston the importance of the Regional Conferences is greatly increased. On the basis of past experience the Western Conference meeting falls within the permitted conferences without having to secure special permission. However, it is our desire to cooperate in every way with the O.D.T. and so registration and application have been made for permission to hold the meeting. The regional director of the O.D.T. assures us that permission will be granted. The meetings will be held at the Hinsdale Unitarian Church, May 13, 14, and 15, 1945.

BOOKS YOU SHOULD HAVE

Hello, Man, by Kenneth L. Patton. $1.00.
Litany for All Souls, by Lucien Price. $1.00.

The latter is a book of especial value to have for oneself or to give to families where there has been an untimely death. It is of exceptional help for those who have lost friends or relatives in the war.

Order now from the Western Unitarian Conference.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY WILL BE HELD